

REMARKS

This patent application presently includes claims 2-5, 11-14, 18 and 19, all of which stand rejected. Reconsideration of all rejections is respectfully requested in view of the comments which follow. Claims 6, 8 and 15-17 have been canceled and claim 18 has been amended to define the invention more clearly, and claim 19 has been amended to correct an inadvertent typographical error.

The examiner has objected to the title as not descriptive of the invention. In response, the title has been amended, and it is now believed to be properly descriptive of the invention.

The examiner is thanked for the courtesy of an interview held on December 22, 2005, with the participation of. Susan McFadden, primary examiner. At that time, the present amendment was proposed and arguments were presented in favor of patentability which is set forth in detail below. At the conclusion of the interview, the examiner is agreed that the rejections over Luther and Dietz under 35 U.S.C. §102 would be withdrawn and further searching undertaken. In addition, it was agreed that claims 18 and 19, as presently amended, or allowable, subject to further searching.

Claim it is 2 - 4 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as anticipated by Dietz U.S. Patent No. 6,175,820. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Dietz does not teach or suggest the present invention.

Claims 11-14 all include the feature that a characteristic of a speaker is determined based on using voiceprint information and that the characteristic is used to control processing of character data obtained from the conversion of the speech information. This feature is disclosed in the application at paragraph [70]. Dietz does not even remotely suggest the use of voiceprints, or that the information derived from them could be of any value in this type of speech processing system or that it could be of any benefit. The fact that Dietz discloses the use of a type of information that may also be present in a voiceprint teaches nothing about the use of voiceprint information. Thus, claims 11-14 are believed to distinguish patentably over Dietz and should be allowed. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 11 and are believed to be allowable based upon their dependence from an allowable claim.

Claims 18 and 19 were rejected as anticipated by Hoory et al. US Patent No. 6,785,649. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Hoory does not teach or suggest the present invention.

Claims 18 and 19 relate to a method for information transmission. Only character data is transmitted over a network while permitting full reproduction of voice data at a receiving location connected to the network. This is disclosed in the application in Figure 10 and paragraphs [0113]-[0124]. It is a particularly bandwidth efficient way to transmit voice information and is not taught or suggested by the cited art. Hoory discloses nothing about transmission of information, much less transmission over a network including a remote server. It is directed only to speech/text conversion and the direct connection of the text signal to a printer or personal digital assistant for printing or storage, without the slightest suggestion of use in a network. In such applications, bandwidth utilization would be of little concern. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be allowable.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Dietz in view of Hoory. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Neither Dietz, nor Hoory, nor the combination thereof renders this claim obvious.

Hoory discloses absolutely nothing about the use of voiceprints or voiceprint information in speech/text processing or that it would be of any benefit. Accordingly, Hoory provides no disclosure that would affect the allowability of claim 11. Claim 11 is therefore allowable over the combination of Dietz and Hoory. Claim 2 depends from claim 11 and is allowable based upon its dependence from an allowable claim.

Claim 6 was rejected as anticipated by Luther US Patent No. 5,555,343; and claim 8 was rejected as obvious over Hoory in view of Boss et al. US Patent No. 5, 933, 805. The cancellation of these claims in the present amendment renders both of these rejections moot.


As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully

requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: January 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Joseph B. Lerch
Registration No.: 26,936
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant